

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1, 11, 32 and 33. These sheets, which include Figs. 1, 11, 32 and 33, replace the original sheets including Figs. 1, 11, 32 and 33.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application and entry of the foregoing amendments are respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's withdrawal of the requirement for restriction.

In response to the Examiner's comments regarding the Information Disclosure Statement filed October 25, 2005, submitted herewith are copies of the Vlahovici et al, Hamada et al, Balon et al, Morgan et al and Yamada et al articles and a PTO/SB/08a Form listing same. The Examiner is requested to acknowledge consideration of the documents by initialing and returning the Form.

The Examiner's objection to the drawings is moot in view of other above-referenced submission of replacement sheets that include Figs. 1A-1K. Replacement sheets for Figs. 11, 32-33 are provided that are of superior quality to those of the published PCT.

The specification has been revised to include a section headed "Brief Description of the Drawings". This revision does not add new matter. The title has been revised to be more descriptive. With these revisions, withdrawal of the objections to the specification is requested.

The Examiner objections to the claims are moot in view of the above-noted claim revisions. Specifically, claim 8 has been corrected as requested by the Examiner. Claims 19-22 have been amended to incorporate the word "heating". The spelling of the term "polynucleotide" has been corrected in claim 24 (thereby obviating the objection against claims 24 and 29). Claims 35 and 38 have been amended to end in a period. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 USC 101. Cancellation of the claims renders the rejection moot.

Claims 1-46 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Withdrawal of the rejection is submitted to be in order for the reasons that follow.

The cancellation of claims 1 and 2 renders moot the rejection of those claims as indefinite.

Claim 3 has been revised in a manner that is believed to address the Examiner's concerns, support for the revision being found in claim 3 of the PCT as published (see also third paragraph on page 7 of the application).

With regard to the rejection of claim 4, a dependent claim directed to the feature of the medium containing more than 50% by volume of the solvent has been added (see new claim 47).

The above-noted amendments to claim 7-46 are believed to address the Examiner's concerns as regards these claims.

Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(b) over Deere et al and claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) over Lemp et al. Cancellation of these claims renders both rejections moot.

This application is submitted to be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is requested.

DOUGLAS et al.
Appl. No. 10/554,266
July 17, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Mary J. Wilson/
Mary J. Wilson
Reg. No. 32,955

MJW:tat
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100